Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-16 are pending in the above-identified application and stand rejected. By the present Amendment, claims 1-5, 8, 12 and 13 are amended.

Telephone Interview

Applicants' Representative thanks Examiner Corrielus for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview conducted on May 8, 2009. During the interview, Applicants' Representative discussed the rejection of claim 1 and proposed amendments to the claim. Agreement was reached that an amendment to claim 1 would overcome the rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,126,642 to Takechi et al.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. By the present Amendment, Applicants amend the independent claims to add recitations of "a memory storing a database" and features associated therewith. Support for these amendments may be found in the originally filed application at page 18, lines 7-23, and page 29, lines 5-11, for example. Because the recitation of "a memory" is part of a physical device, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed system is a machine within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-16 and favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action notes that the recitations of "a tied manner beforehand" in the claims are unclear. By the present Amendment, Applicants reword the recitations of "a tied manner beforehand."

The Office Action also notes that recitations in claims 1-4 are unclear. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the limitations of "the acquisition," "in the meantime," "by the request," and "on the basic [sic: basis]" do not have sufficient antecedent basis. By the present Amendment, Applicants amended these limitations to reword them and recite sufficient antecedent basis.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the claims for being indefinite be withdrawn and that the claims be reconsidered and allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,126,642 to Takechi et al. ("Takechi"). Applicants amend claims 1, 2 and 4 by the present Amendment. Applicants respectfully assert that Takechi does not disclose all of the features recited in claims 1, 2 and 4.

In particular, Takechi does not disclose all of the following features of claim 1, for example:

> a control signal detecting section to identify (1) **the type of each of the control signals,** (2) **an identifier** for uniquely specifying each control signal , and (3) **a time of detection** of one of the control signals;
>
> . . .
>
> a control signal attribute information managing section to manage the identifier and corresponding attribute information of each of the control signals and **to identify the attribute information of the one of the control signals stored in the database depending on an identifier of the one of the control signals obtained at the control signal detecting section**; and
>
> an index generating section **to generate metadata** . . . . (Emphasis added.)

Support for these features may be found throughout the above-identified application, for example, at page 13, line 16 through page 19, line 14, and Figs. 3, 4 and 7. No new matter has been added.

With respect to the features relating to "a control signal detection section," the Office Action cites to Column 2, lines 45-52, of Takechi as disclosed in these features. With respect to the features relating to "a control signal attribute information managing section," the Office Action cites to Column 4, lines 29-35, of Takechi. With respect to the features relating to "an index generating section," the Office Action cites to Column 10, lines 61-65, and FIG. 11 of Takechi. Applicants respectfully assert that these portions of Takechi do not disclose all of the features of claim 1 quoted above.

Takechi discloses an image display apparatus 10 that "automatically judges the occurrence of a picture defect and changes an image display start position so that an image can be displayed without changing the aspect ratio of an input image signal." (See Takechi, Column 2, lines 4-7.) The image display apparatus 10 includes a memory means 22 in which image information is stored (see Takechi, Column 3, line 64 through Column 4, line 10) and an address control signal generation means 30 for controlling the readout of the image information stored in the memory means 22 to compensate for defects in the image (see Takechi, Column 4, lines 25-35).

1.   "control signal detecting section"

The portion of Takechi (Column 2, lines 45-52) cited in the Office Action as disclosing the "control signal detecting section" does not describe: (1) **a type of each of a plurality of control signals**, (2) an "identifier for uniquely specifying each control signal," and (3) **a time of detection** of each control signal, as required by claim 1. This portion of Takechi describes detecting one signal, a telop signal. (See Takechi, Column 2, lines 47-48.) It does not describe a plurality of control signals, nor does it describe determining the time of signal detection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Takechi does not disclose all of the features of the "control signal detecting section" recited in claim 1.

2.   "control signal attribute information managing section"

The portion of Takechi (Column 4, lines 29-35) cited in the Office Action as disclosing the features of the "control signal attribute information managing section" describes that the "region of an image displayed on the screen can be changed in any direction of horizontal and vertical directions by controlling a readout start address for the memory means 22 on the basis of an address control signal." (See Takechi, Column 4, lines 31-34.) This portion of Takechi does not describe a "managing section" that manages the "**identifier** of each of the control signals" and **corresponding attribute information**, as required in the above-quoted portion of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Takechi does not disclose all of the features of the "control signal attribute information managing section" recited in claim 1.

3.   "index generating section"

Finally, the Office Action cites to Column 10, lines 61-65 of Takechi as disclosing the features of claim 1 relating to the "index generating section." This portion of Takechi describes

an address control signal used in an embodiment where the image display apparatus 10 detects defects depending upon the presence of a telop. (See Takechi, Column 11, line 61 to Column 12, line 8.) This portion of Takechi does not describe the generation of metadata. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Takechi does not disclose all of the features of the "index generating section" recited in claim 1

4.   Conclusion on the Rejections of Claims 1-4

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that Takechi does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and reconsideration and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 4, while not identical to claim 1, recite features similarly recited in claim 1. Accordingly, for at least some of the same reasons as those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Takechi does not disclose all of the features of claims 2 and 4. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2 and 4 and reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takechi in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,293,279 to Asmussen. Applicants amend claim 3 by the present Amendment. Applicants respectfully assert that neither Takechi, nor Asmussen, nor their combination discloses or suggest all of the features recited in claim 3.

In particular, neither Takechi, nor Asmussen, nor their combination discloses or suggests the following features of claim 3, for example:

> a control signal detecting section to detect a control signal of a VCR with which the VCR is switched, **identify an identifier thereof**, and obtain **a time of the detection** of the control signal;

> . . .

> a control signal attribute information managing section to manage the identifier and corresponding attribute information of each of the control signals, including the control signal of the VCR, and **to identify the attribute information of the control signal of the VCR stored in the database depending on the identifier of the VCR obtained at the control signal detecting section**; and

> an index generating section **to generate metadata** . . . (Emphasis added.)

Support for these features may be found throughout the above-identified application, for example, at page 13, line 16 through page 19, line 14; page 28, line 4 through page 29, line 11; and Figs. 3, 4, 7, and 11. No new matter has been added.

For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Takechi does not describe determining the time of signal detection. Additionally, for similar reasons, Takechi does not describe a "managing section" (1) that manages the "**identifier** of each of the control signals" and **corresponding attribute information** and (2) that identifies "the attribute information of the control signal of the VCR stored in the database," as required by claim 3. Further, for similar reasons, Takechi does not describe an "index generating section" that generates metadata.

Asmussen relates to a television program delivery system. Asmussen does not disclose or suggest all of the above-quoted features missing from Takechi. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Takechi, nor Asmussen, nor their combination discloses or suggests all of the features of claim 3. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 and reconsideration and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 5-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takechi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,724,433 to Engebretson et al. ("Engebretson"). Engebretson relates to an adaptive filtering circuit. Engebretson does not disclose or suggest all of the above-quoted of features of claim 1, from which claims 5-16 ultimately depend, missing from Takechi. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Takechi, nor Engebretson, nor their combination discloses or suggests all of the features of claims 5-16. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-16 and reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully assert that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicants

PKZ/dmw

Dated: May 19, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM412076